



Margin Status is Still an Important Prognostic Factor in Hepatectomies for Colorectal Liver Metastases: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis

Submitted by Beatrice Guillaumat on Thu, 07/11/2019 - 11:54

Titre	Margin Status is Still an Important Prognostic Factor in Hepatectomies for Colorectal Liver Metastases: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis
Type de publication	Article de revue
Auteur	Memeo, Riccardo [1], de Blasi, Vito [2], Adam, Rene [3], Goéré, Diane [4], Piardi, Tullio [5], Lermite, Emilie [6], Turrini, Olivier [7], Navarro, Francis [8], de'Angelis, Nicola [9], Sa Cunha, Antonio [10], Pessaux, Patrick [11]
Organisme	French Colorectal Liver Metastases Working Group [12], Association Française de Chirurgie (AFC) [13]
Editeur	Springer
Type	Article scientifique dans une revue à comité de lecture
Année	2018
Langue	Anglais
Date	Mars 2018
Numéro	3
Pagination	892-901
Volume	42
Titre de la revue	World Journal of Surgery
ISSN	1432-2323
Mots-clés	Adenocarcinoma [14], Adult [15], Aged [16], Colorectal Neoplasms [17], Female [18], Hepatectomy [19], Humans [20], Liver neoplasms [21], Male [22], Margins of Excision [23], Middle Aged [24], Multivariate Analysis [25], Prognosis [26], Propensity score [27], Retrospective Studies [28], Risk Factors [29], Survival Analysis [30]

	<p>OBJECTIVE: The width of resection margin is still a matter of debate in case of colorectal liver metastasis resection. The aim of this study was to determine the risk factors for R1 resection. Once risk factors had been identified, patients were matched according to Fong's prognostic criteria, in order to evaluate whether R1 resection still remained a negative prognostic factor impacting overall and disease-free survival.</p> <p>METHODS: A total of 1784 hepatectomies were analyzed from a multicentric retrospective cohort of hepatectomies. Patients were compared before and after a 1:1 propensity score analysis in order to compare R0 versus R1 resections according to Fong criteria.</p> <p>RESULTS: Primary tumor nodes found positive after colorectal resection (RR = 1.20, p = 0.02), operative time (> 240 min) (RR = 1.26, p = 0.05), synchronous liver metastasis (RR = 1.27, p = 0.02), pedicle clamping (> 40 min) (RR = 1.52, p = 0.001), lesion size larger than 50 mm (RR = 1.54, p = 0.001), rehepatectomy (RR = 1.68, p = 0.001), more than 3 lesions (RR = 1.69, p = 0.0001), and bilateral lesions (RR = 1.74, p = 0.0001) were identified as risk factors in multivariate analysis. After a 1:1 PSM according to Fong criteria, R1 resection still remained a negative prognostic factor impacting overall and disease-free survival, with 1-, 3-, 5-year OS at 94, 81, and 70% in R0 and 92, 75, and 58% in R1, respectively, (p = 0.008), and disease-free survival (DFS) with 1-, 3-, 5-year survival at 64, 41, and 28% in R0 versus 51, 28, and 18% in R1 (p = 0.0002), respectively.</p> <p>CONCLUSION: Even after using PSM as an oncological prognostic criterion, R1 resection still impacts overall and disease-free survival negatively.</p>
Résumé en anglais	
URL de la notice	http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications/ua19946 [31]
DOI	10.1007/s00268-017-4229-7 [32]
Lien vers le document	https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00268-017-4229-7 [33]
Titre abrégé	World J Surg
Identifiant (ID) PubMed	28929341 [34]

Liens

- [1] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=32754>
- [2] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=32755>
- [3] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=32756>
- [4] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=32757>
- [5] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=22506>
- [6] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/em.lerm/publications>
- [7] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=38155>
- [8] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=31602>
- [9] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=32759>
- [10] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=32761>
- [11] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=5181>
- [12] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=38225>
- [13] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=38224>
- [14] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=8465>
- [15] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=1002>
- [16] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=1072>
- [17] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=10290>
- [18] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=1075>

- [19] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=10438>
- [20] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=991>
- [21] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=7769>
- [22] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=968>
- [23] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=26050>
- [24] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=5941>
- [25] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=8053>
- [26] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=1341>
- [27] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=26872>
- [28] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=6125>
- [29] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=6041>
- [30] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bkeyword%5D=7826>
- [31] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications/ua19946>
- [32] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00268-017-4229-7>
- [33] <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00268-017-4229-7>
- [34] <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28929341?dopt=Abstract>

Publié sur *Okina* (<http://okina.univ-angers.fr>)